

SUPERIOR COURT OF ARIZONA
MARICOPA COUNTY

*** FILED ***
11/01/2001

10/30/2001

CLERK OF THE COURT
FORM V000A

HONORABLE CATHY M. HOLT

E. Schneider
Deputy

CV 2000-018665

FILED: _____

CARSTEN HAIRCUTTERS INC, et al.

VERONICA MANOLIO

v.

DIZIN SALON, et al.

JOHN M MCKINDLES

EDWIN B STANLEY

MINUTE ENTRY

This is the time se for a Rule 16 Scheduling Conference and for oral argument on Defendants Dizin Salon's and Manning's Motion for Summary Judgment. Vernica Manolio appears in person on behalf of the plaintiff. John M. McKindles appears in person on behalf of Defendants Dizin Salon and Frankie and David Manning. Edwin B. Stanley appears telephonically on behalf of Defendants Pendleton, Grimm, Bau, Farnum and Smith.

Court Reporter: Jane Westlund

Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment is argued and taken under advisement.

IT IS ORDERED setting a continued Pretrial Conference on **Tuesday, December 18, 2001 at 8:30 a.m.** before this division.

NOTE: JUDGE HOLT'S DIVISION IS LOCATED IN THE OLD COURTHOUSE, 125 W. WASHINGTON, 3RD FLOOR, SUITE 309, PHOENIX, ARIZONA 85003 (TEL: (602) 506-3105).

SUPERIOR COURT OF ARIZONA
MARICOPA COUNTY

*** FILED ***
11/01/2001

10/30/2001

CLERK OF THE COURT
FORM V000A

HONORABLE CATHY M. HOLT

E. Schneider
Deputy

CV 2000-018665

Counsel for the plaintiff(s) and defendant(s) are to meet personally before the Pretrial Conference to discuss those subjects listed under ARCP, Rule 16(b). Counsel for plaintiff(s) and defendant(s) shall prepare and file a Joint Pretrial Conference Memorandum no later than 5:00 p.m., December 13, 2001, addressing all applicable subjects listed under ARCP, Rule 16(b) and, **IN ADDITION, A BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE NATURE OF THE CASE, THE ISSUES, AND EACH PARTY'S POSITION WITH RESPECT TO THE ISSUES, AND THE ESTIMATED LENGTH OF THE TRIAL.**

If counsel are unable to agree on any of the items in the Joint Pretrial Conference Memorandum, the reasons for their inability to agree shall be set forth in the memorandum.

Counsel are reminded that the Court may impose sanctions against counsel and/or their client for failure to participate in good faith in the Joint Pretrial Conference Memorandum or the Pretrial Conference.

LATER:

The Court having taken under advisement Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment,

IT IS ORDERED denying the Motion in that genuine issues of material fact exist, including, whether Defendants had knowledge of the contract, whether Defendants intentionally interfered with the contract and if Defendants acts with improper motive.